

Generalization and Exploration via Randomized Value Functions

Ian Osband
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
iosband@stanford.edu

Benjamin Van Roy
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305
bvr@stanford.edu

Zheng Wen
Yahoo Labs
Sunnyvale, CA 94089
zhengwen@yahoo-inc.com

Abstract

We propose randomized least-squares value iteration (RLSVI) – a new reinforcement learning algorithm designed to explore and generalize efficiently via linearly parameterized value functions. We explain why versions of least-squares value iteration that use Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration can be highly inefficient, and we present computational results that demonstrate dramatic efficiency gains enjoyed by RLSVI. Further, we establish an upper bound on the expected regret of RLSVI that demonstrates near-optimality in a *tabula rasa* learning context. More broadly, our results suggest that randomized value functions offer a promising approach to tackling a critical challenge in reinforcement learning: synthesizing efficient exploration and effective generalization.

1 Introduction

The design of reinforcement learning (RL) algorithms that explore intractably large state-action spaces efficiently remains an important challenge. In this paper, we propose randomized least-squares value iteration (RLSVI), which generalizes using a linearly parameterized value function. Prior RL algorithms that generalize in this way require, in the worst case, learning times exponential in the number of model parameters and/or the planning horizon. RLSVI aims to overcome these inefficiencies.

RLSVI operates in a manner similar to least-squares value iteration (LSVI) and also shares much of the spirit of other closely related approaches such as TD, LSTD, and SARSA (see, e.g., [25, 26]). What fundamentally distinguishes RLSVI is that the algorithm explores through randomly sampling statistically plausible value functions, whereas the aforementioned alternatives are typically applied in conjunction with action-dithering schemes such as Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration, which lead to highly inefficient learning. The concept of exploring by sampling statistically plausible value functions is broader than any specific algorithm, and beyond our proposal and study of RLSVI. We view an important role of this paper to be in establishing this broad concept as a promising approach to tackling a critical challenge in RL: synthesizing efficient exploration and effective generalization.

We will present computational results comparing RLSVI to LSVI with action-dithering schemes. In our case studies, these algorithms generalize using identical linearly parameterized value functions but are distinguished by how they explore. The results demonstrate that RLSVI enjoys dramatic efficiency gains. Further, we establish a bound on the expected regret for an episodic *tabula rasa* learning context. Our bound is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{S\mathcal{A}HT})$, where S and $\mathcal{A}$ denote the cardinalities of the state and action spaces, T denotes time elapsed, and H denotes the episode duration. This matches the worst case lower bound for this problem up to logarithmic factors [7]. It is interesting to contrast this against

known $\tilde{O}(S\sqrt{AHT})$ bounds for other provably efficient *tabula rasa* RL algorithms (e.g., UCRL2 [7]) adapted to this context. To our knowledge, our results establish RLSVI as the first RL algorithm that is provably efficient in a *tabula rasa* context and also demonstrates efficiency when generalizing via linearly parameterized value functions.

There is a sizable literature on RL algorithms that are provably efficient in *tabula rasa* contexts [3, 8, 9, 12, 17, 18, 24]. The literature on RL algorithms that generalize and explore in a provably efficient manner is sparser. There is work on model-based RL algorithms [1, 19, 20], which apply to specific model classes and are computationally intractable. Value function generalization approaches have the potential to overcome those computational challenges and offer practical means for synthesizing efficient exploration and effective generalization. A relevant line of work establishes that efficient RL with value function generalization reduces to efficient KWIK online regression [14, 15]. However, it is not known whether the KWIK online regression problem can be solved efficiently. In terms of concrete algorithms, there is optimistic constraint propagation (OCP) [28], a provably efficient RL algorithm for exploration and value function generalization in deterministic systems, and C-PACE [21], a provably efficient RL algorithm that generalizes using interpolative representations. These contributions represent important developments, but OCP is not suitable for stochastic systems and is highly sensitive to model mis-specification, and generalizing effectively in high-dimensional state spaces calls for methods that extrapolate. RLSVI advances this research agenda, leveraging randomized value functions to explore efficiently with linearly parameterized value functions. The only other work we know of involving exploration through random sampling of value functions is [4]. That work proposed an algorithm for *tabula rasa* learning; the algorithm does not generalize over the state-action space.

2 Episodic reinforcement learning framework

A finite-horizon MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P, R, \pi)$, where $\mathcal{S}$ is a finite state space, $\mathcal{A}$ is a finite action space, H is the number of periods, P encodes transition probabilities, R encodes reward distributions, and π is a state distribution. In each episode, the initial state s_0 is sampled from π , and, in period $h = 0, 1, \dots, H-1$, if the state is s_h and an action a_h is selected then a next state s_{h+1} is sampled from $P_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h)$ and a reward r_h is sampled from $R_h(\cdot|s_h, a_h, s_{h+1})$. The episode terminates when state s_H is reached, at which time a terminal reward is sampled from $R_H(\cdot|s_H)$.

To represent the history of actions and observations over multiple episodes, we will often index variables by both episode and period. For example, s_{lh} , a_{lh} and r_{lh} respectively denote the state, action, and reward observed during period h in episode l .

A policy $\mu = (\mu_0, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_{H-1})$ is a sequence of functions, each mapping $\mathcal{S}$ to $\mathcal{A}$. For each policy μ , we define a value function

$$V_h^\mu(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left[\sum_{\tau=h}^H r_\tau \middle| s_h = s, a_h = \mu_h(s_h), \dots, a_{H-1} = \mu_{H-1}(s_{H-1}) \right] \quad \text{for } h = 0, \dots, H.$$

The optimal value function is defined by $V_h^*(s) = \sup_{\mu} V_h^\mu(s)$. A policy μ^* is said to be optimal if $V^{\mu^*} = V^*$. It is also useful to define a state-action optimal value function:

$$Q_h^*(s, a) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} [r_h + V_{h+1}^*(s_{h+1}) | s_h = s, a_h = a] \quad \text{for } h = 1, \dots, H-1. \quad (1)$$

Then, a policy μ^* is optimal if and only if $\mu_h^*(s) \in \arg \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} Q_h^*(s, \alpha)$, $\forall s, h$.

A reinforcement learning algorithm generates each action a_{lh} based on observations made up to period h of episode l . Over each episode, the algorithm realizes reward $\sum_{h=0}^H r_{lh}$. One way to quantify the performance of a reinforcement learning algorithm is in terms of the *expected cumulative regret* over L episodes, or time $T = LH$, defined by

$$\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M}) = \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{M}} \left[V_0^*(s_{l0}) - \sum_{h=0}^H r_{lh} \right]. \quad (2)$$

Consider a scenario in which the agent models that, for each h , $Q_h^* \in \text{span}[\Phi_h]$ for some $\Phi_h \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times K}$. With some abuse of notation, we use S and A to denote the cardinalities of the state and action spaces. We refer this matrix Φ_h as a *generalization matrix* and use $\Phi_h(s, a)$ to denote the row of matrix Φ_h associated with state-action pair (s, a) . For $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, we write the k th column of Φ_h as ϕ_{hk} and refer to ϕ_{hk} as a basis function. We refer to contexts where the agent's belief is correct as *coherent learning*. The alternative is *agnostic learning*.

3 Randomized actions

LSVI can be applied at the beginning of each episode to estimate the optimal value function Q^* from data gathered over previous episodes. To form an RL algorithm based on LSVI, we must specify how the agent selects actions. A common scheme is to select actions that are nearly greedy with respect to value estimates, differing from greedy behavior only due to random perturbations induced by Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration. Appendix A presents RL algorithms resulting from combining LSVI with each of these exploration schemes.

As is well recognized in the efficient RL literature (see, e.g., [10, 3, 7]), simple schemes like Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration can lead to regret that grows exponentially in H and/or S . This literature provides more intelligent exploration schemes that are provably efficient, but these schemes only apply to the case of *tabula rasa* RL, where little prior information is available and learning is considered efficient even if the time required scales with the cardinality of the state-action space. In a sense, RLSVI represents a synthesis of ideas from efficient *tabula rasa* reinforcement learning and value function generalization methods.

To motivate some of the benefits of RLSVI, we first provide a simple example. In this setting LSVI with Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration requires exponentially many episodes to learn an optimal policy, even in a coherent learning context and even with a small number of basis functions.




Figure 1: An MDP for which Boltzmann and ϵ -greedy exploration are highly inefficient.

Example 1. Consider the MDP illustrated in Figure 1. Each node represents a state, and each arrow corresponds to a possible state transition. The state space is $\mathcal{S} = \{0, 1, \dots, N-1\}$ and the action space is $\mathcal{A} = \{a^{(1)}, a^{(2)}\}$. At the red nodes, the agent can take action $a^{(1)}$ to transition to $y = [x-1]^+$ or take action $a^{(2)}$ to transition to $y = x+1$. The green node is absorbing. A reward of 0 is realized upon any transition from a red node and a reward of 1 is realized upon any transition from the green node. There is no terminal reward. Let $H = N$ and set $s_{i0} = 0, \forall i$.

Suppose we apply LSVI with either Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration. Let l^* be the first episode during which state $N-1$ is visited. It is easy to see that $\theta_{lh} = 0$ for all h and all $l < l^*$. Furthermore, with either exploration scheme, actions are sampled uniformly at random over episodes $l < l^*$. Thus, in any episode $i < i^*$, the green node will be reached with probability $2^{-(H-1)} = 2^{-(S-1)}$. It follows that $E[l^*] \geq 2^{S-1}$ and $\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M}) \geq (2^{S-1} - 1) \left(1 - [1 - 2^{-(S-1)}]^{T/H}\right)$. Note that $\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M}) \geq 2^{S-1} - 1$.

Note that the lower bound established for this example applies to both coherent and agnostic learning for any choice of basis functions and algorithm parameters. The bound indicates that regret must grow exponentially in S .

4 Randomized value functions

We now consider an alternative approach to exploration that involves randomly sampling value functions rather than actions. As a specific scheme of this kind, we propose randomized least-squares value iteration (RLSVI), which we present as Algorithm 1.¹ To obtain an RL algorithm, we simply select greedy actions in each episode, as specified in Algorithm 2.

The manner in which RLSVI explores is inspired by Thompson sampling [27], which has been shown to explore efficiently across a very general class of online optimization problems [22, 23]. In Thompson sampling, the agent samples from a posterior distribution over models, and selects the action that optimizes the sampled model. RLSVI

¹Note that when $l = 0$, both A and b are empty, hence, we set $\hat{\theta}_{l0} = \hat{\theta}_{l1} = \dots = \hat{\theta}_{l,H-1} = 0$.

Algorithm 1 Randomized Least-Squares Value Iteration

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{SA \times K}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\lambda > 0$, $\{s_{i0}, a_{i0}, r_{i0}, \dots, s_{iH}, r_{iH} : i < L\}$ **Output:** $\hat{\theta}_{l0}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{l,H-1}$

- 1: $\hat{\theta}_{lH} \leftarrow 0$, $\Phi_H \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$
- 2: **for** $h = H - 1, \dots, 1, 0$ **do**
- 3: Generate regression matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{l \times K}$ and vector $b \in \mathbb{R}^l$:

$$A \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_h(s_{0h}, a_{0h}) \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_h(s_{l-1,h}, a_{l-1,h}) \end{bmatrix} \quad b_i \leftarrow \begin{cases} r_{ih} + \max_{\alpha} \left(\Phi_{h+1} \hat{\theta}_{l,h+1} \right) (s_{i,h+1}, \alpha) & \text{if } h < H - 1 \\ r_{ih} + r_{i,h+1} & \text{if } h = H - 1 \end{cases}$$

- 4: Estimate value function

$$\bar{\theta}_{lh} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} A^\top A + \lambda I \right)^{-1} A^\top b \quad \Sigma_{lh} \leftarrow \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} A^\top A + \lambda I \right)^{-1}$$

- 5: Sample $\hat{\theta}_{lh} \sim N(\bar{\theta}_{lh}, \Sigma_{lh})$
 - 6: **end for**
-

Algorithm 2 RLSVI with greedy action

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{SA \times K}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\lambda > 0$

- 1: **for** $l = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 2: Compute $\hat{\theta}_{l0}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{l,H-1}$ using Algorithm 1
 - 3: Observe s_{l0}
 - 4: **for** $h = 0, \dots, H - 1$ **do**
 - 5: Sample $a_{lh} \in \arg \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\Phi_h \hat{\theta}_{lh} \right) (s_{lh}, \alpha)$
 - 6: Observe r_{lh} and $s_{l,h+1}$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: Observe r_{lH}
 - 9: **end for**
-

similarly samples from a distribution over plausible value functions and selects actions that optimize resulting samples. This distribution can be thought of as an approximation to a posterior distribution over value functions. RLSVI bears a close connection to PSRL [18], which maintains and samples from a posterior distribution over MDPs and is a direct application of Thompson sampling to RL. PSRL has been shown to satisfy regret bounds that scale with the dimensionality, rather than the cardinality, of the underlying MDP [20, 19]. However, PSRL does not accommodate value function generalization without MDP planning, a feature that we expect to be of great practical importance.

5 Computational study on a chain environment

In this section, we report results of applying RLSVI to Example 1 with $N = |\mathcal{S}| = H = 50$. We focus on interpretation of results. Appendix B provides more detail on, as well as pseudocode for, our computational study.

Our first pair of graphs compare per-episode reward of RLSVI and LSVI with Boltzman exploration. Each plot represents an average over many independent simulations. For each simulation, we generate a new set of $K = 20$ random basis functions such that the optimal value function is contained within their span; hence, we are working in a coherent learning setting. Recall that, for the MDP under consideration, the maximal per-episode reward is 1. The results suggest that RLSVI on average learns the optimal policy within a couple hundred episodes, whereas Boltzmann exploration generates negligible reward even after 10^9 episodes. This should not be surprising in light of the analysis of

Section 3.² It is worth mentioning that results for ϵ -greedy exploration are similar to those for Boltzmann exploration, though they are omitted from the figure. For RLSVI, we set $\lambda = 1$ and $\sigma^2 = 10^{-4}$. As we will show later, the performance of RLSVI remains strong for a wide range of parameter values around these settings.




Figure 2: Computational Study of Example 1

Figure 2(c) illustrates how results influenced by the number of basis functions K . As one would expect, the time

²It is worth mentioning that the results for Boltzmann exploration in this example are essentially independent of the temperature setting; all settings lead to negligible reward. Specifically, the lower bound in Example 1 implies that for $N = 50$, LSVI with Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration would require more than 5.63×10^{14} episodes on average to learn the optimal policy, for any choice of the algorithm parameters.

RLSVI requires to learn the optimal policy increases as the number of basis functions increases. Figure 2(d) demonstrates that performance degrades gracefully as learning migrates to the agnostic regime. What is plotted is cumulative regret over 400 episodes as a function of *expected normalized distance*, a measure of the degree of model mis-specification. Specifically, the *expected normalized distance* is the expectation over randomly generated basis functions of the Euclidean-norm distance between the span of the basis functions and Q^* , normalized by $\|Q^*\|_2$. The key observation is that regret grows gradually, not abruptly, with the degree of model mis-specification.

Figure 2(e) and 2(f) demonstrate the performances of RLSVI as algorithm parameters (λ and σ^2) vary. These results indicate that for a wide range of λ or σ^2 , RLSVI learns the optimal policy within 400 episodes. However, too large σ^2 or λ leads to slow learning. This makes sense since large values of σ^2 induce excessive exploration, and large values of λ lead to over-regularization.

6 Computational study on a simple recommendation system

Section 5 shows that RLSVI can outperform other algorithms on a toy problem designed to require efficient exploration. In this section we will show that efficient exploration and generalization can be helpful in a simple model of customer interaction.

Consider a setting in which an agent can recommend $J \leq N$ among products $\mathcal{Z} = \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ sequentially to a customer. The conditional probability that the customer likes each product depends on the products observed beforehand and whether or not she liked them. We will represent the products the customer has seen by $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$. For each of the observed products $n \in \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ we will indicate $x_n \in \{-1, +1\}$ for her preferences {dislike, like} respectively. If the customer has not observed the product $n \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ we will write $x_n = 0$. For our model, we will assume that the probability that the customer will like a new product $a \notin \tilde{\mathcal{Z}}$ is given by a logistic transformation linear in x :

$$\mathbb{P}(a|x) = \exp\left(\beta_a + \sum_n \gamma_{an}x_n\right) / \left(1 + \exp\left(\beta_a + \sum_n \gamma_{an}x_n\right)\right). \quad (3)$$

Importantly, this model reflects that the customers' preferences may evolve as their experiences change. For example, a customer may be much more likely to watch season five of "The Wire" if they have watched all four of the preceding seasons.

The agent in this setting is the recommendation system, whose goal is to maximize the cumulative amount of items liked through time for each customer. The agent does not know $p(a|x)$ initially, but can learn to estimate the parameters β, γ through interactions across different customers. Each customer is modeled as an episode with horizon length $H = J$ with no previous observed products $\tilde{\mathcal{Z}} = \emptyset$. For our simulations we set $\beta_a = 0 \forall a$ and sample a random problem instance by sampling $\gamma_{an} \sim N(0, c^2)$ independently for each a and n .




Figure 3: Computational study of simplified recommendation system

Notice that in this setting the number of possible states $|\mathcal{S}| = |\{-1, 0, +1\}|^H = 3^J$ is exponential in J . In this setting it is crucial that we can exploit generalization between states as per equation (3) to learn efficiently over timeframes much smaller than $|\mathcal{S}|$. For this problem we consider the RLSVI algorithm and construct the following simple basis functions: $\forall 1 \leq n, m, a \leq N$, let $\phi_m(x, a) = \mathbf{1}\{a = m\}$ and $\phi_{mn}(x, a) = x_n \mathbf{1}\{a = m\}$, and let these ϕ_m 's and ϕ_{mn} 's serve as basis functions for each period. Thus, the dimension of our function class $K = N^2 + N$ is much smaller than the number of states. In the absence of a freak event, we are faced with an agnostic learning problem, since the true value function does not lie in the span of our basis functions.

Figure 3 shows that RLSVI successfully learns to behave well in this setting. On the left in (a) we plot the cumulative regret of RLSVI when compared against Boltzmann exploration. We see that RLSVI quickly learns a better policy than this naïve methods of exploration in reinforcement learning. On the right in (b) we show that this reinforcement learning policy is able to outperform not only benchmark bandit algorithms but also the myopic policy. Bernoulli Thompson sampling does not learn much even after 600 episodes, since the algorithm does not take *context* into account. Since learning the myopic policy is easier than learning a multi-period policy, it is not surprising that the linear contextual bandit approach outperforms RLSVI at first. However as more data is gathered RLSVI eventually learns a richer policy which outperforms the myopic policy. Full details on the experiment set up are available in Appendix C.2 and C.3.

Appendix C.1 provides pseudocode for this computational study. We experiment with example for which $N = 10$, $H = J = 5$, $c = 2$ and $L = 600$. Note that such problems have $|\mathcal{S}| = 4521$ states; this allows us to solve each MDP exactly so that we can compute regret. Each result is averaged over 50 problem instances and for each problem instance, we repeat simulations 5 times. The cumulative regret for both RLSVI (with $\lambda = 0.2$ and $\sigma^2 = 10^{-3}$) and LSVI with Boltzmann exploration (with $\lambda = 0.2$ and a variety of “temperature” settings η) are plotted in Figure 3(a). In our view, the results favor RLSVI over LSVI with Boltzmann exploration.

It is interesting to explore the potential *value of RL* over multi-armed bandit approaches used in recommendation systems and other customer interactions. Although equation (3) represents a very simple model, our results suggest that in settings of repeated customer interaction an efficient reinforcement learning algorithm may outperform even state-of-the-art myopic algorithms, particularly where larger amounts of data are available.

7 Regret bound for the *tabula rasa* case

We will establish an expected regret bound for RLSVI applied in a *tabula rasa* context, in which each generalization matrix is an identity matrix: $\Phi_h = I$. The bound is on an expectation with respect to a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. We define the MDP $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P, R, \pi)$ and all other random variables we will consider with respect to this probability space. We assume that $\mathcal{S}$, $\mathcal{A}$, H , and π , are deterministic. Though we can carry out a very similar analysis for cases where R is random, to simplify the analysis in this short paper, we will assume that R is deterministic, transition rewards are deterministic and equal to zero, and terminal rewards are deterministic and take values given by a function $\bar{R}(s) \in [-0.5, 0.5]$ with $\sum_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \bar{R}(s) = 0$. We assume that the state distributions $P_h(\cdot | x_h, a_h)$ are independent across (x_h, a_h) and each uniformly distributed over the $|\mathcal{S}|$ -dimensional unit simplex. Hence, the reward function is deterministic and the transition distributions are sampled from a Dirichlet prior. Our regret bound is provided in the following result, which we prove in the remainder of this section.

Theorem 1. *If Algorithm 2 is executed with $\Phi_h = I$ for $h = 0, \dots, H - 1$, $\lambda = \mathcal{S}$, and $\sigma = 1$ then*

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M})] = \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{SAHT}\right),$$

where integer-valued $T = LH$ for some integer number of episodes L .

7.1 Preliminaries

Central to our analysis is the following notion of stochastic optimism, which induces a partial ordering among random variables.

Definition 1. We say a real-valued random variable x is stochastically optimistic relative to a real-valued random variable y if for any real-valued random variable z that is independent of x and y , $\mathbb{E}[\max(x, z)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\max(y, z)]$.

We will use the notation $x \succ_{\text{so}} y$ to express this relation. It is worth noting that stochastic optimism is closely connected with second-order stochastic dominance: $x \succ_{\text{so}} y$ if and only if $-y$ second-order stochastically dominates $-x$ [6]. The following result establishes such a relation involving Gaussian and Dirichlet random variables.

Lemma 1. For all $v \in [0, 1]^N$ and $\alpha \in [1, \infty)^N$, if $x \sim N(\alpha^\top v / \alpha^\top \mathbf{1}, 1/\alpha^\top \mathbf{1})$ and $y = p^\top v$ for $p \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$ then $x \succ_{\text{so}} y$.

Our proof of this relation, which appears in Appendix D, is long, though the intuition is simple. We essentially show that, for any α , $y =_D x + w$, for a mean-preserving spread w . This implies $x \succ_{\text{so}} y$.

Let $\hat{Q}_h^l = \Phi_h \hat{\theta}_{lh} = \hat{\theta}_{lh}$ and $\hat{\mu}_l$ denote the value function and policy generated by RLSVI for episode l , and let $\hat{V}_h^l(s) = \max_a \hat{Q}_h^l(s, a)$. We can write expected regret as

$$\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M}) = \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \mathbb{E}[V_0^*(s_{l0}) - V_0^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s_{l0})].$$

The per-episode regret decomposes according to

$$V_0^*(s_{l0}) - V_0^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s_{l0}) = \underbrace{\hat{V}_0^l(s_{l0}) - V_0^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s_{l0})}_{A_l} + \underbrace{V_0^*(s_{l0}) - \hat{V}_0^l(s_{l0})}_{B_l}. \quad (4)$$

We will bound this regret by first showing that RLSVI generates optimistic estimates of V^* , so that B_l has nonpositive expectation. The remaining term A_l vanishes as estimates generated by RLSVI concentrate around V^* .

Let $\mathcal{F}_l$ denote the history of observations made prior to the beginning of episode l . Further, we let $\omega_0, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots$ be an iid sequence such that, for each l , the random sampling carried out by RLSVI to compute $(\hat{\theta}_{l0}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{l, H-1})$ is determined by ω_l .

7.2 Optimism

In this section, we will prove that $\mathbb{E}[B_l | \mathcal{F}_l] \leq 0$. Our proof relies on the following lemma, which establishes that RLSVI generates estimates that are stochastically optimistic relative to the optimal value function.

Lemma 2. Conditioned on $\mathcal{F}_l$, for all (h, s, a) , $\hat{Q}_h^l(s, a) \succ_{\text{so}} Q_h^*(s, a)$.

Proof. We will prove the result by induction on h . Let us first consider as a base case the case of $h = H - 1$. In this case, $Q_h^*(s, a) = \sum_{s'} P_h(s' | s, a) \bar{R}_h(s')$. Conditioned on H_l , $P_h(\cdot | s, a)$ is Dirichlet with parameters $(\alpha_{s'} = n_{lh}(s, a, s') + 1 : s' \in \mathcal{S})$, where $n_{lh}(s, a, s')$ denotes the number of times the transition (h, s, a, s') was observed prior to episode l . Some algebra show that

$$\bar{\theta}_{lh}(s, a) = \frac{\sum_{s'} n_{lh}(s, a, s') \bar{R}(s')}{\sum_{s'} n_{lh}(s, a, s') + \lambda} = \frac{\sum_{s'} (n_{lh}(s, a, s') + 1) \bar{R}(s')}{\sum_{s'} (n_{lh}(s, a, s') + 1)} = \frac{\sum_{s'} \alpha_{s'} \bar{R}_h(s')}{\sum_{s'} \alpha_{s'}}.$$

Further, Σ_{lh} is diagonal with

$$\Sigma_{lh}((s, a), (s, a)) = \frac{1}{\sum_{s'} n_{lh}(s, a, s') + \lambda} = \frac{1}{\sum_{s'} (n_{lh}(s, a, s') + 1)} = \frac{1}{\sum_{s'} \alpha_{s'}}.$$

Hence, $\hat{\theta}_{lh}(s, a) \sim N(\bar{\theta}_{lh}(s, a), \Sigma_{lh}((s, a), (s, a))) \sim N(\alpha^\top \bar{R} / \alpha^\top \mathbf{1}, 1/\alpha^\top \mathbf{1})$, and since $\hat{Q}_h^l(s, a) = \hat{\theta}_{lh}$, it follows from Lemma 1 that $\hat{Q}_h^l(s, a) \succ_{\text{so}} Q_h^*(s, a)$.

Now consider the case of $h < H - 1$, assuming that $\hat{Q}_{h+1}^l(s, a) \succ_{\text{so}} Q_{h+1}^*(s, a)$. By the definition of stochastic optimism and the fact that $\hat{V}_{h+1}^l(s) = \max_a \hat{Q}_{h+1}^l(s, a)$, we have $\hat{V}_{h+1}^l(s) \succ_{\text{so}} Q_{h+1}^*(s, a)$. An argument entirely analogous to that used for the base case establishes that $P_h(\cdot | s, a)$ is Dirichlet with parameters $(\alpha_{s'} = n_{lh}(s, a, s') + 1 : s' \in \mathcal{S})$ and $\hat{\theta}_{lh}(s, a) \sim N(\alpha^\top \hat{V}_{h+1}^l / \alpha^\top \mathbf{1}, 1/\alpha^\top \mathbf{1})$, and therefore, $\hat{Q}_h^l(s, a) \succ_{\text{so}} Q_h^*(s, a)$. $\square$

It follows from Lemma 2 that, for all (s, a) , $\mathbb{E}[B_l | \mathcal{F}_l] \leq 0$.

7.3 Estimation error

Let $w_{lh} = \hat{\theta}_{lh} - \bar{\theta}_{lh}$. The following result relates value estimation errors to these differences.

Lemma 3. For $l = 0, 1, \dots$, $\mathbb{E}[A_l \mid \mathcal{F}_l] = \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \mathbb{E}[w_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh}) \mid \mathcal{F}_l]$.

Proof. Let $\bar{P}_{lh}(s' \mid s, a) = \mathbb{E}[P_{lh}(s' \mid s, a) \mid \mathcal{F}_l]$. Conditioned on $(\mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l)$, P_h is independent from $V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}$. Hence, $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{s'} P_h(s' \mid s, a) V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s') \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{s'} \bar{P}_{lh}(s' \mid s, a) V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s') \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l]$. Further, conditioned on $(\mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l)$, $\hat{\mu}_l$, (s_{lh}, a_{lh}) is independent of $V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}$, so

$$\mathbb{E}[V_h^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s_{lh}) \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{s'} P_h(s' \mid s_{lh}, a_{lh}) V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s') \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{s'} \bar{P}_h(s' \mid s_{lh}, a_{lh}) V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s') \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l].$$

Since, conditioned on $(\mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l)$, $\hat{V}_{h+1}^l$ is deterministic, so we also have

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{V}_h^l(s_{lh}) \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l] = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{s'} \bar{P}_h(s' \mid s_{lh}, a_{lh}) \hat{V}_{h+1}^l(s') \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l] + \mathbb{E}[w_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh}) \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \omega_l].$$

Let $d_{lh} = \mathbb{E}[\sum_{s'} \bar{P}_h(s' \mid s_{lh}, a_{lh}) (\hat{V}_{h+1}^l(s') - V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s')) \mid \mathcal{F}_l] - (\hat{V}_{h+1}^l(s_{l,h+1}) - V_{h+1}^{\hat{\mu}_l}(s_{l,h+1}))$, and note that $\mathbb{E}[d_h \mid \mathcal{F}_l] = 0$. The result follows from simple algebra. $\square$

RLSVI samples $\hat{\theta}_{lh}(s, a)$ from $N(\bar{\theta}_{lh}(s, a), 1/(n_{lh}(s, a) + \mathcal{S}))$, where $n_{lh}(s, a)$ denotes the number of times (h, s, a) has been observed prior to episode l . However, $\mathbb{E}[w_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh})]$ is generally nonzero because (s_{lh}, a_{lh}) can depend on the samples. We will use the following concentration inequality [2] to bound these terms.

Lemma 4. For all $\mu \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\sigma^2 \in \mathfrak{R}_{++}$, and $\gamma \in \mathfrak{R}$, if $x \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ then

$$\mathbb{P}(|x - \mu| > \gamma\sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}e^{-\gamma^2/2}.$$

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the event that $\max_{h,s,a} (w_{lh}(s, a) - \sqrt{\frac{4 \log(\mathcal{SAHT})}{n_{lh}(s,a) + \mathcal{S}}}) > 0$. It follows from Lemma 4, with $\gamma = \sqrt{4 \log \mathcal{SAHT}}$, and the union bound that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \leq \frac{1}{2\mathcal{SAHT}^2}$.

We have one more lemma to help bound the contribution of A_l even under event $\mathcal{E}$.

Lemma 5. For $X \sim N(0, 1)$ and any $\lambda > 1$: $\mathbb{E}[X \mid X > \lambda] \leq \lambda + 1$.

Proof. We make use of a standard integral and bounds for the normal CDF Φ in terms of its PDF ϕ :

$$\mathbb{E}[X \mid X > \lambda] = \frac{\phi(\lambda)}{1 - \Phi(\lambda)} \leq \frac{\phi(\lambda)}{\frac{\lambda}{\lambda^2 + 1} \phi(\lambda)} \leq \lambda + 1.$$

$\square$

We can use Lemma 3 together with 5 to bound the estimation error under event $\mathcal{E}$:

$$\mathbb{E}[A_l \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \mathcal{E}] \leq \sum_{h,s,a} \mathbb{E}[w_{lh}(s, a) \mid \mathcal{F}_l, \mathcal{E}] \leq \sum_{h,s,a} \frac{\sqrt{4 \log(\mathcal{SAHT})} + 1}{\sqrt{n_{lh}(s, a) + \mathcal{S}}} \leq \mathcal{SAH} (2\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{SAHT})} + 1).$$

7.4 Concluding the proof

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} [\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M})] &= \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{E} [A_l + B_l | \mathcal{F}_l]] \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}) \times \mathbb{E}[A_l | \mathcal{F}_l, \mathcal{E}] + \mathbb{E}[A_l | \mathcal{F}_l, \mathcal{E}^c] + 0] \\
&\leq \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \left\{ \frac{1}{2\mathcal{S}AHT^2} \times \mathcal{S}AH \left(2\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{S}AHT)} + 1 \right) + \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \sqrt{\frac{4\log(\mathcal{S}AHT)}{n_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh}) + \mathcal{S}}} \right\} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{S}AHT)} + 1}{T^2} \right) + 2\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{S}AHT)} \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh}) + \mathcal{S}}}.
\end{aligned}$$

We now complete the proof using a standard integral comparison. For T such that $L = T/H$ is integer-valued and $\mathcal{S} > H$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh}) + \mathcal{S}}} &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{T/H-1} \sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n_{lh}(s_{lh}, a_{lh}) + H}} \\
&\leq \sum_{(h,s,a)} \sum_{n=1}^{n_{L-1,h}(s,a)} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \leq \sum_{(h,s,a)} 2\sqrt{n_{L-1,h}(s,a)} \leq 2\sqrt{\mathcal{S}AHT}.
\end{aligned}$$

The case for $\mathcal{S} \leq H$ can be dealt with similarly as per Appendix B in [18]. Piecing this all together we can say:

$$\mathbb{E} [\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M})] \leq \frac{\sqrt{\log(\mathcal{S}AHT)} + 1}{T^2} + 4\sqrt{\mathcal{S}AHT \log(\mathcal{S}AHT)} \quad (5)$$

which completes our proof.

8 Closing remarks

We have established a regret bound that affirms efficiency of RLSVI in a *tabula rasa learning* context. We believe that the real promise of RLSVI, however, lies in its potential as an efficient method for exploration in large-scale problems that require generalization. Our computational results suggest that, when coupled with generalization, RLSVI enjoys levels of efficiency far beyond what can be achieved by Boltzmann or ϵ -greedy exploration. We leave as an open problem establishing efficiency guarantees in such contexts. To stimulate thinking on this topic, we put forth a conjecture.

Conjecture 1. For all $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, H, P, R, \pi)$, $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1}$, σ , and λ , if reward distributions R have support $[-\sigma, \sigma]$, there is a unique $(\theta_0, \dots, \theta_{H-1}) \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times H}$ satisfying $Q_h^* = \Phi_h \theta_h$ for $h = 0, \dots, H-1$, and $\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \|\theta_h\|^2 \leq \frac{KH}{\lambda}$, then there exists a polynomial poly such that

$$\text{Regret}(T, \mathcal{M}) \leq \sqrt{T} \text{poly} \left(K, H, \max_{h,x,a} \|\Phi_h(x, a)\|, \sigma, 1/\lambda \right).$$

As one would hope for from an RL algorithm that generalizes, this bound does not depend on the number of states or actions. Instead, there is a dependence on the number of basis functions.

Finally, although RLSVI is tailored to linear value function representation, we believe it may also be possible to draw practical inspiration from this algorithm even with non-linear forms. In particular, we are motivated by the success of highly non-linear “deep” neural net representations of the value function for general purpose RL [16]. However, current state of the art algorithms still struggle to match human performance in several domains that require complex or multi-period strategies. One possible contributing factor to this performance shortfall is that their current form of exploration ϵ -greedy is extremely inefficient. An adaptation of RLSVI that instead samples approximate posterior samples for non-linear value function representations, for example via the online bootstrap [5], may help to explore the environment more efficiently.

9 Extensions

We now briefly discuss a couple possible extensions of the version of RLSVI proposed in Algorithm 1 and 2. One is an incremental version which is computationally more efficient. The other addresses continual learning in an infinite horizon discounted Markov decision process. In the same sense that RLSVI shares much with LSVI but is distinguished by its new approach to exploration, these extensions share much with least-squares Q-learning [11].

9.1 Incremental learning

Note that Algorithm 1 is a batch learning algorithm, in the sense that, in each episode l , though Σ_{lh} 's can be computed incrementally, it needs all past observations to compute $\bar{\theta}_{lh}$'s. Thus, its per-episode compute time grows with l , which is undesirable if the algorithm is applied over many episodes.

One way to fix this problem is to derive an incremental RLSVI that updates $\bar{\theta}_{lh}$'s and Σ_{lh} 's using summary statistics of past data and new observations made over the most recent episode. One approach is to do this by computing

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{l+1,h}^{-1} &\leftarrow (1 - \nu_l)\Sigma_{lh}^{-1} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2}\Phi_h(x_{lh}, a_{lh})^\top \Phi_h(x_{lh}, a_{lh}) \\ y_{l+1,h} &\leftarrow (1 - \nu_l)y_{lh} + \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left[r_{lh} + \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\Phi_{h+1}\hat{\theta}_{l,h+1} \right) (x_{l,h+1}, \alpha) \right] \Phi_h(x_{lh}, a_{lh})^\top,\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

and setting $\bar{\theta}_{l+1,h} = \Sigma_{l+1,h}^{-1} y_{l+1,h}$. Note that we sample $\hat{\theta}_{lh} \sim N(\bar{\theta}_{lh}, \Sigma_{lh})$, and initialize $y_{0h} = 0$, $\Sigma_{0h}^{-1} = \lambda I$, $\forall h$. The step size ν_l controls the influence of past observations on Σ_{lh} and $\bar{\theta}_{lh}$. Once $\hat{\theta}_{lh}$'s are computed, the actions are chosen based on Algorithm 2. Another approach would be simply to approximate the solution for $\bar{\theta}_{lh}$ numerically via random sampling and stochastic gradient descent similar to other works with non-linear architectures [16]. The per-episode compute time of these incremental algorithms are episode-independent, which allows for deployment at large scale. On the other hand, we expect the batch version of RLSVI to be more data efficient and thus incur lower regret.

9.2 Continual learning

Finally, we propose a version of RLSVI for RL in infinite-horizon time-invariant discounted MDPs. A discounted MDP is identified by a sextuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, \gamma, P, R, \pi)$, where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is the discount factor. $\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{A}, P, R, \pi$ are defined similarly with the finite horizon case. Specifically, in each time $t = 0, 1, \dots$, if the state is x_t and an action a_t is selected then a subsequent state x_{t+1} is sampled from $P(\cdot|x_t, a_t)$ and a reward r_t is sampled from $R(\cdot|x_t, a_t, x_{t+1})$. We also use V^* to denote the optimal state value function, and Q^* to denote the optimal action-contingent value function. Note that V^* and Q^* do not depend on t in this case.

Similarly with the episodic case, an RL algorithm generates each action a_t based on observations made up to time t , including all states, actions, and rewards observed in previous time steps, as well as the state space $\mathcal{S}$, action space $\mathcal{A}$, discount factor γ , and possible prior information. We consider a scenario in which the agent has prior knowledge that Q^* lies within a linear space spanned by a generalization matrix $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times K}$.

A version of RLSVI for continual learning is presented in Algorithm 3. Note that $\hat{\theta}_t$ and w_t are values computed by the algorithm in the previous time period. We initialize $\hat{\theta}_0 = 0$ and $w_0 = 0$. Similarly to Algorithm 1, Algorithm 3 randomly perturbs value estimates in directions of significant uncertainty to incentivize exploration. Note that the random perturbation vectors $w_{t+1} \sim N(\sqrt{1 - \gamma^2}w_t, \gamma^2\Sigma_{t+1})$ are sampled to ensure autocorrelation and that marginal covariance matrices of consecutive perturbations differ only slightly. In each period t , once $\hat{\theta}_t$ is computed, a greedy action is selected. Avoiding frequent abrupt changes in the perturbation vector is important as this allows the agent to execute on multi-period plans to reach poorly understood state-action pairs.

Algorithm 3 Continual RLSVI

Input: $\hat{\theta}_t \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $w_t \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $\Phi \in \mathbb{R}^{|S||\mathcal{A}| \times K}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\lambda > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\{(x_\tau, a_\tau, r_\tau) : \tau \leq t\}$, x_{t+1}

Output: $\hat{\theta}_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}^K$, $w_{t+1} \in \mathbb{R}^K$

1: Generate regression matrix and vector

$$A \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Phi(x_0, a_0) \\ \vdots \\ \Phi(x_t, a_t) \end{bmatrix} \quad b \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} r_0 + \gamma \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (\Phi \hat{\theta}_t)(x_1, \alpha) \\ \vdots \\ r_t + \gamma \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (\Phi \hat{\theta}_t)(x_{t+1}, \alpha) \end{bmatrix}$$

2: Estimate value function

$$\bar{\theta}_{t+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} A^\top A + \lambda I \right)^{-1} A^\top b \quad \Sigma_{t+1} \leftarrow \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} A^\top A + \lambda I \right)^{-1}$$

3: Sample $w_{t+1} \sim N(\sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} w_t, \gamma^2 \Sigma_{t+1})$

4: Set $\hat{\theta}_{t+1} = \bar{\theta}_{t+1} + w_{t+1}$

References

- [1] Yasin Abbasi-Yadkori and Csaba Szepesvári. Regret bounds for the adaptive control of linear quadratic systems. *Journal of Machine Learning Research - Proceedings Track*, 19:1–26, 2011.
- [2] Shipra Agrawal and Navin Goyal. Further optimal regret bounds for Thompson sampling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1209.3353*, 2012.
- [3] Ronen I. Brafman and Moshe Tennenholtz. R-max - a general polynomial time algorithm for near-optimal reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3:213–231, 2002.
- [4] Richard Dearden, Nir Friedman, and Stuart J. Russell. Bayesian Q-learning. In *AAAI/IAAI*, pages 761–768, 1998.
- [5] Bradley Efron. *The jackknife, the bootstrap and other resampling plans*, volume 38. SIAM, 1982.
- [6] Josef Hadar and William R Russell. Rules for ordering uncertain prospects. *The American Economic Review*, pages 25–34, 1969.
- [7] Thomas Jaksch, Ronald Ortner, and Peter Auer. Near-optimal regret bounds for reinforcement learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:1563–1600, 2010.
- [8] Sham Kakade. *On the Sample Complexity of Reinforcement Learning*. PhD thesis, University College London, 2003.
- [9] Michael J. Kearns and Daphne Koller. Efficient reinforcement learning in factored MDPs. In *IJCAI*, pages 740–747, 1999.
- [10] Michael J. Kearns and Satinder P. Singh. Near-optimal reinforcement learning in polynomial time. *Machine Learning*, 49(2-3):209–232, 2002.
- [11] Michail Lagoudakis, Ronald Parr, and Michael L. Littman. Least-squares methods in reinforcement learning for control. In *Second Hellenic Conference on Artificial Intelligence (SETN-02)*, 2002.
- [12] Tor Lattimore, Marcus Hutter, and Peter Sunehag. The sample-complexity of general reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, 2013.
- [13] Haim Levy. Stochastic dominance and expected utility: survey and analysis. *Management Science*, 38(4):555–593, 1992.

- [14] Lihong Li and Michael Littman. Reducing reinforcement learning to KWIK online regression. *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 2010.
- [15] Lihong Li, Michael L. Littman, and Thomas J. Walsh. Knows what it knows: a framework for self-aware learning. In *ICML*, pages 568–575, 2008.
- [16] Volodymyr et al. Mnih. Human-level control through deep reinforcement learning. *Nature*, 518(7540):529–533, 2015.
- [17] Ronald Ortner and Daniil Ryabko. Online regret bounds for undiscounted continuous reinforcement learning. In *NIPS*, 2012.
- [18] Ian Osband, Daniel Russo, and Benjamin Van Roy. (More) efficient reinforcement learning via posterior sampling. In *NIPS*, pages 3003–3011. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [19] Ian Osband and Benjamin Van Roy. Model-based reinforcement learning and the eluder dimension. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1466–1474, 2014.
- [20] Ian Osband and Benjamin Van Roy. Near-optimal reinforcement learning in factored MDPs. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 604–612, 2014.
- [21] Jason Pazis and Ronald Parr. PAC optimal exploration in continuous space Markov decision processes. In *AAAI*. Citeseer, 2013.
- [22] Dan Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. Eluder dimension and the sample complexity of optimistic exploration. In *NIPS*, pages 2256–2264. Curran Associates, Inc., 2013.
- [23] Daniel Russo and Benjamin Van Roy. Learning to optimize via posterior sampling. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 39(4):1221–1243, 2014.
- [24] Alexander L. Strehl, Lihong Li, Eric Wiewiora, John Langford, and Michael L. Littman. PAC model-free reinforcement learning. In *ICML*, pages 881–888, 2006.
- [25] Richard Sutton and Andrew Barto. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. MIT Press, March 1998.
- [26] Csaba Szepesvári. *Algorithms for Reinforcement Learning*. Synthesis Lectures on Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning. Morgan & Claypool Publishers, 2010.
- [27] W.R. Thompson. On the likelihood that one unknown probability exceeds another in view of the evidence of two samples. *Biometrika*, 25(3/4):285–294, 1933.
- [28] Zheng Wen and Benjamin Van Roy. Efficient exploration and value function generalization in deterministic systems. In *NIPS*, pages 3021–3029, 2013.

APPENDICES

A LSVI with Boltzmann exploration/ ϵ -greedy exploration

The LSVI algorithm iterates backwards over time periods in the planning horizon, in each iteration fitting a value function to the sum of immediate rewards and value estimates of the next period. Each value function is fitted via least-squares: note that vectors θ_{lh} satisfy

$$\theta_{lh} \in \arg \min_{\zeta \in \mathbb{R}^K} (\|A\zeta - b\|^2 + \lambda \|\zeta\|^2). \quad (7)$$

Notice that in Algorithm 4, when $l = 0$, matrix A and vector b are empty. In this case, we simply set $\theta_{l0} = \theta_{l1} = \dots = \theta_{l,H-1} = 0$.

Algorithm 4 Least-Squares Value Iteration

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times K}$, $\lambda > 0$, $\{(x_{ih}, a_{ih}, r_{ih}) : i < l, h = 0, \dots, H-1\}$

Output: $\theta_{l0}, \dots, \theta_{l,H-1}$

- 1: $\theta_{lH} \leftarrow 0, \Phi_H \leftarrow \mathbf{0}$
- 2: **for** $h = H-1, \dots, 1, 0$ **do**
- 3: Generate regression matrix and vector

$$A \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_h(x_{0h}, a_{0h}) \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_h(x_{l-1,h}, a_{l-1,h}) \end{bmatrix} \quad b \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} r_{0,h} + \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (\Phi_{h+1} \theta_{l,h+1})(x_{0,h+1}, \alpha) \\ \vdots \\ r_{l-1,h} + \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (\Phi_{h+1} \theta_{l,h+1})(x_{l-1,h+1}, \alpha) \end{bmatrix}$$

- 4: Estimate value function

$$\theta_{lh} \leftarrow (A^\top A + \lambda I)^{-1} A^\top b$$

- 5: **end for**
-

RL algorithms produced by synthesizing Boltzmann exploration or ϵ -greedy exploration with LSVI are presented as Algorithms 5 and 6. Note that the “temperature” parameters η in Boltzmann exploration and ϵ in ϵ -greedy exploration control the degree to which random perturbations distort greedy actions.

Algorithm 5 LSVI with Boltzmann exploration

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times K}$, $\lambda > 0$, $\eta > 0$

- 1: **for** $l = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 2: Compute $\theta_{l0}, \dots, \theta_{l,H-1}$ based on Algorithm 4
 - 3: Observe x_{l0}
 - 4: **for** $h = 0, 1, \dots, H-1$ **do**
 - 5: Sample $a_{lh} \sim \mathbb{E}[(\Phi_h \theta_{lh})(x_{lh}, a)/\eta]$
 - 6: Observe r_{lh} and $x_{l,h+1}$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **end for**
-

Algorithm 6 LSVI with ϵ -greedy exploration

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{S \times K}$, $\lambda > 0$, $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$

```

1: for  $l = 0, 1, \dots$  do
2:   Compute  $\theta_{l0}, \dots, \theta_{l,H-1}$  using Algorithm 4
3:   Observe  $x_{l0}$ 
4:   for  $h = 0, 1, \dots, H-1$  do
5:     Sample  $\xi \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\epsilon)$ 
6:     if  $\xi = 1$  then
7:       Sample  $a_{lh} \sim \text{unif}(\mathcal{A})$ 
8:     else
9:       Sample  $a_{lh} \in \arg \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} (\Phi_h \theta_{lh})(x_{lh}, \alpha)$ 
10:    end if
11:    Observe  $r_{lh}$  and  $x_{l,h+1}$ 
12:  end for
13: end for

```

B Experiment setup for section 5

B.1 Coherent Learning

In the coherent learning case, $Q_h^* \in \text{span}[\Phi_h]$ for each period h . Recall that we use ϕ_{hk} to denote the k th basis function, which is the k th column of Φ_h . Each set of $M = 200$ simulations that we carry out to obtain estimates of episode regret is conducted in a manner specified by Algorithm 7

Algorithm 7 Coherent Learning Simulation

Input: $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $\sigma > 0$, $\lambda > 0$, $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$

Output: $\hat{\Delta}(0), \dots, \hat{\Delta}(L-1)$

```

for  $m = 1, \dots, M$  do
  for  $h = 0, \dots, H-1$  do
    for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
      switch ( $k$ )
      case 1:
         $\phi_{hk} \leftarrow Q_h^*$ 
      case 2:
         $\phi_{hk} \leftarrow 1$ 
      default:
        Sample  $\phi_{hk} \sim N(0, I)$ 
      end switch
    end for
  end for
  Simulate RLSVI over  $L$  episodes; observe episode rewards  $R^{(m0)}, \dots, R^{(m,L-1)}$ 
end for
for  $l = 0, 1, \dots, L-1$  do
   $\hat{\Delta}(l) = V_0^*(x_{l0}) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M R^{(ml)}$ 
end for

```

Notice that $\hat{\Delta}(l)$ is the estimated episode regret in episode l . The estimated cumulative regret over L episodes is defined as $\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \hat{\Delta}(l)$. $V_0^*(x_{l0}) - \hat{\Delta}(l) = 1 - \hat{\Delta}(l)$ is the estimated episode reward in episode l .

Figure 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(e), and 2(f) show the simulation results of the coherent learning. Specifically, they run Algorithm 7 with the following parameters:

- Figure 2(a): $M = 200, L = 400, N = H = |\mathcal{S}| = 50, K = 20, \lambda = 1$, and $\sigma^2 = 10^{-4}$.
- Figure 2(b): $M = 200, L = 1500^3, N = H = |\mathcal{S}| = 50, K = 20, \lambda = 1$, and $\sigma^2 = 10^{-4}$.
- Figure 2(c): $M = 200, L = 400, N = H = |\mathcal{S}| = 50, \lambda = 1, \sigma^2 = 10^{-4}, K = 2, 5, 10, 20$.
- Figure 2(e), $M = 200, L = 400, N = H = |\mathcal{S}| = 50, \sigma^2 = 10^{-4}, K = 20, \lambda = 10^{-4}, 10^{-2}, 1, 10, 10^2, 10^4$.
- Figure 2(f), $M = 200, L = 400, N = H = |\mathcal{S}| = 50, \lambda = 1, K = 20, \sigma^2 = 10^{-9}, 10^{-6}, 10^{-4}, 10^{-2}, 1$.

B.2 Agnostic learning

The pseudocode of agnostic learning simulation is specified in Algorithm 8. Compared with the pseudocode in the coherent learning case (Algorithm 7), it differs only in its construction of the basis functions for each time period. Specifically, in the agnostic learning case, we choose $\phi_{h1} = \mathbf{1}$ and $\phi_{hk} = Q_h^* + \rho\psi_{hk}$ for any $k = 2, 3, \dots, K$, where ψ_{hk} is sampled independently from $N(0, I)$ and $\rho \geq 0$ is a chosen scalar. Note that if $\rho = 0$, this case reduces to a coherent learning case. As ρ grows, the basis functions are increasingly distorted and the distance between the optimal value function and the span of the basis functions is likely to grow.

Algorithm 8 Agnostic Learning Simulation

Input: $K \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}, \rho \geq 0, \sigma > 0, \lambda > 0, L \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}, M \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$

Output: $\hat{\Delta}(0), \dots, \hat{\Delta}(L-1)$

```

for  $m = 1, \dots, M$  do
  for  $h = 0, \dots, H-1$  do
    for  $k = 1, \dots, K$  do
      switch ( $k$ )
      case 1:
         $\phi_{hk} \leftarrow \mathbf{1}$ 
      default:
        Sample  $\psi_{hk} \sim N(0, I)$ 
         $\phi_{hk} \leftarrow Q_h^* + \rho\psi_{hk}$ 
      end switch
    end for
  end for
  Simulate RLSVI over  $L$  episodes; observe episode rewards  $R^{(m0)}, \dots, R^{(m, L-1)}$ 
end for
for  $l = 0, 1, \dots, L-1$  do
   $\hat{\Delta}(l) = V_0^*(x_{l0}) - \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M R^{(ml)}$ 
end for

```

Similarly, the estimated cumulative regret over L episodes is defined as $\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \hat{\Delta}(l)$. The simulation result is plotted in Figure 2(d). In this computational study, we choose $K = 11, \lambda = 1, \sigma^2 = 10^{-3}, M = 200, L = 400$ and vary $\rho = 0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, 0.1$.

We now describe how to compute the expected normalized distance for each ρ . For a fixed ρ , assume that in simulation $m = 1, \dots, M$, the randomly generated generalization matrices are $\Phi_0^{(m)}, \Phi_1^{(m)}, \dots, \Phi_{H-1}^{(m)}$, then the expected normalized distance for this ρ is computed as

$$\text{expected normalized distance} = \frac{1}{M \sqrt{\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \|Q_h^*\|_2^2}} \sum_{m=1}^M \sqrt{\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \min_{\theta} \|Q_h^* - \Phi_h^{(m)} \theta\|_2^2}, \quad (8)$$

³We actually run the simulation for 1500 episodes rather than 10^9 episodes, but the simulation results indicate that RLSVI learns the optimal policy way before 1500 episodes.

where $\sqrt{\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \|Q_h^*\|_2^2}$ is the Euclidean norm of Q^* , and $\sqrt{\sum_{h=0}^{H-1} \min_{\theta} \|Q_h^* - \Phi_h^{(m)} \theta\|_2^2}$ is the distance between Q^* and the span of basis functions in simulation m .

C Experiment setup for section 6

C.1 RLSVI vs. Boltzmann Exploration (Figure 3(a))

The simulation pseudocode in this case is specified in Algorithm 9.

Algorithm 9 Recommendation System: RLSVI vs. Boltzmann Exploration Simulation

Input: $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $J = H \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $c > 0$, $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$

Output: $\hat{\Delta}(0), \dots, \hat{\Delta}(L-1)$

for $i = 1, \dots, 50$ **do**

 Randomly sample a problem instance by sampling γ_{an} i.i.d. from $N(0, c^2)$

 Repeat the Bernoulli bandit algorithm for 100 times

 Repeat the linear contextual bandit algorithm for 100 times

for each $\eta \in \{10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}, 1, 10\}$ **do**

 Repeat LSVI with Boltzmann exploration for 5 times, with parameter $\lambda = 0.2$ and η

end for

 Repeat RLSVI for 5 times, with parameter $\lambda = 0.2$ and $\sigma^2 = 10^{-3}$

end for

Compute the estimated episode/cumulative regret for each algorithm

Recall that we choose $N = 10$, $J = H = 5$, $c = 2$ and $L = 600$.

C.2 Bernoulli bandit algorithm

In this subsection, we describe the Bernoulli bandit algorithm, which is a Thompson sampling algorithm with weak beta prior and is detailed in Algorithm 10.

Algorithm 10 Bernoulli bandit algorithm

Input: $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $J \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$, $L \in \mathbb{Z}_{++}$

Initialization: Set $\alpha_n = \beta_n = 1, \forall n = 1, 2, \dots, N$

for $l = 0, \dots, L-1$ **do**

 Randomly sample $\hat{p}_{ln} \sim \text{beta}(\alpha_n, \beta_n), \forall n = 1, \dots, N$

 Sort $\hat{p}_{ln}$'s in the descending order, and recommend the first J products **in order** to the customer

for $n = 1, \dots, N$ **do**

if product n is recommended in episode l **then**

 Update $\alpha_n \leftarrow \alpha_n + 1$ if the customer likes product n ; otherwise, update $\beta_n \leftarrow \beta_n + 1$

end if

end for

end for

C.3 Linear contextual bandit algorithm

In this subsection, we describe the linear contextual bandit algorithm. The linear contextual bandit algorithm is similar to RLSVI, but without *backward value propagation*, a key feature of RLSVI. It is straightforward to see that the linear

contextual bandit algorithm aims to learn the myopic policy. This algorithm is specified in Algorithm 11 and 12. Notice that this algorithm can be implemented incrementally, hence, it is computationally efficient. In this computational study, we use the same basis functions as RLSVI, and the same algorithm parameters (i.e. $\lambda = 0.2$ and $\sigma^2 = 10^{-3}$).

Algorithm 11 Randomized exploration in linear contextual bandits

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times K}, \sigma > 0, \lambda > 0, \{(x_{ih}, a_{ih}, r_{ih}) : i < l, h = 0, \dots, H-1\}$

Output: $\hat{\theta}_{l0}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{l,H-1}$

- 1: $\hat{\theta}_{lH} \leftarrow 0, \Phi_H \leftarrow 0$
- 2: **for** $h = H-1, \dots, 1, 0$ **do**
- 3: Generate regression matrix and vector

$$A \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} \Phi_h(x_{0h}, a_{0h}) \\ \vdots \\ \Phi_h(x_{l-1,h}, a_{l-1,h}) \end{bmatrix} \quad b \leftarrow \begin{bmatrix} r_{0,h} \\ \vdots \\ r_{l-1,h} \end{bmatrix}$$

- 4: Estimate value function

$$\bar{\theta}_{lh} \leftarrow \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} A^\top A + \lambda \sigma^2 I \right)^{-1} A^\top b \quad \Sigma_{lh} \leftarrow \left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2} A^\top A + \lambda I \right)^{-1}$$

- 5: Sample $\hat{\theta}_{lh} \sim N(\bar{\theta}_{lh}, \Sigma_{lh})$
 - 6: **end for**
-

Algorithm 12 Linear contextual bandit algorithm

Input: $\Phi_0, \dots, \Phi_{H-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}||\mathcal{A}| \times K}, \sigma > 0, \lambda > 0$

- 1: **for** $l = 0, 1, \dots$ **do**
 - 2: Compute $\hat{\theta}_{l0}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{l,H-1}$ using Algorithm 11
 - 3: Observe x_{l0}
 - 4: **for** $h = 0, \dots, H-1$ **do**
 - 5: Sample $a_{lh} \sim \text{unif} \left(\arg \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} \left(\Phi_h \hat{\theta}_{lh} \right) (x_{lh}, \alpha) \right)$
 - 6: Observe r_{lh} and $x_{l,h+1}$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: **end for**
-

D Gaussian vs Dirichlet optimism

The goal of this appendix is to prove Lemma 1, reproduced below:

For all $v \in [0, 1]^N$ and $\alpha \in [1, \infty)^N$, if $x \sim N(\alpha^\top v / \alpha^\top \mathbf{1}, 1/\alpha^\top \mathbf{1})$ and $y = p^\top v$ for $p \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$ then $x \succ_{\text{so}} y$.

We begin with a lemma recapping some basic equivalences of stochastic optimism.

Lemma 6 (Optimism equivalence).

The following are equivalent to $X \succ_{\text{so}} Y$:

1. For any random variable Z independent of X and Y , $\mathbb{E}[\max(X, Z)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\max(Y, Z)]$
2. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, $\int_{\alpha}^{\infty} \{\mathbb{P}(X \geq s) - \mathbb{P}(Y \geq s)\} ds \geq 0$.
3. $X =_D Y + A + W$ for $A \geq 0$ and $\mathbb{E}[W|Y + A] = 0$ for all values $y + a$.
4. For any $u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ convex and increasing $\mathbb{E}[u(X)] \geq \mathbb{E}[u(Y)]$

These properties are well known from the theory of second order stochastic dominance [13, 6] but can be re-derived using only elementary integration by parts. $X \succ_{\text{so}} Y$ if and only if $-Y$ is second order stochastic dominant for $-X$.

D.1 Beta vs. Dirichlet

In order to prove Lemma 1 we will first prove an intermediate result that shows a particular Beta distribution $\tilde{y}$ is optimistic for y . Before we can prove this result we first state a more basic result that we will use on Gamma distributions.

Lemma 7. *For independent random variables $\gamma_1 \sim \text{Gamma}(k_1, \theta)$ and $\gamma_2 \sim \text{Gamma}(k_2, \theta)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\gamma_1 | \gamma_1 + \gamma_2] = \frac{k_1}{k_1 + k_2}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}[\gamma_2 | \gamma_1 + \gamma_2] = \frac{k_2}{k_1 + k_2}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2).$$

We can now present our optimistic lemma for Beta versus Dirichlet.

Lemma 8. *Let $y = p^\top v$ for some random variable $p \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\alpha)$ and constants $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$. Without loss of generality, assume $v_1 \leq v_2 \leq \dots \leq v_d$. Let $\tilde{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i(v_i - v_1)/(v_d - v_1)$ and $\tilde{\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i(v_d - v_i)/(v_d - v_1)$. Then, there exists a random variable $\tilde{p} \sim \text{Beta}(\tilde{\alpha}, \tilde{\beta})$ such that, for $\tilde{y} = \tilde{p}v_d + (1 - \tilde{p})v_1$, $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{y}|y] = \mathbb{E}[y]$.*

Proof. Let $\gamma_i = \text{Gamma}(\alpha_i, 1)$, with $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_d$ independent, and let $\bar{\gamma} = \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i$, so that

$$p \equiv_D \gamma / \bar{\gamma}.$$

Let $\alpha_i^0 = \alpha_i(v_i - v_1)/(v_d - v_1)$ and $\alpha_i^1 = \alpha_i(v_d - v_i)/(v_d - v_1)$ so that

$$\alpha = \alpha^0 + \alpha^1.$$

Define independent random variables $\gamma^0 \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_i^0, 1)$ and $\gamma^1 \sim \text{Gamma}(\alpha_i^1, 1)$ so that

$$\gamma \equiv_D \gamma^0 + \gamma^1.$$

Take γ^0 and γ^1 to be independent, and couple these variables with γ so that $\gamma = \gamma^0 + \gamma^1$. Note that $\tilde{\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^0$ and $\tilde{\alpha} = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i^1$. Let $\bar{\gamma}^0 = \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^0$ and $\bar{\gamma}^1 = \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i^1$, so that

$$1 - \tilde{p} \equiv_D \bar{\gamma}^0 / \bar{\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{p} \equiv_D \bar{\gamma}^1 / \bar{\gamma}.$$

Couple these variables so that $1 - \tilde{p} = \bar{\gamma}^0 / \bar{\gamma}$ and $\tilde{p} = \bar{\gamma}^1 / \bar{\gamma}$.

We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\tilde{y}|y] &= \mathbb{E}[(1 - \tilde{p})v_1 + \tilde{p}v_d|y] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v_1\bar{\gamma}^0}{\bar{\gamma}} + \frac{v_d\bar{\gamma}^1}{\bar{\gamma}} \middle| y\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v_1\bar{\gamma}^0 + v_d\bar{\gamma}^1}{\bar{\gamma}} \middle| \gamma, y\right] \middle| y\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v_1\mathbb{E}[\bar{\gamma}^0|\gamma] + v_d\mathbb{E}[\bar{\gamma}^1|\gamma]}{\bar{\gamma}} \middle| y\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v_1 \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\gamma_i^0|\gamma_i] + v_d \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\gamma_i^1|\gamma_i]}{\bar{\gamma}} \middle| y\right] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v_1 \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i \alpha_i^0 / \alpha_i + v_d \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i \alpha_i^1 / \alpha_i}{\bar{\gamma}} \middle| y\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{v_1 \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i (v_i - v_1) + v_d \sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i (v_d - v_i)}{\bar{\gamma}(v_d - v_1)} \middle| y\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \gamma_i v_i}{\bar{\gamma}} \middle| y\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^d p_i v_i \middle| y\right] \\
&= y,
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma 7. □

D.2 Gaussian vs Beta

In the previous section we showed that a matched Beta distribution $\tilde{y}$ would be optimistic for the Dirichlet y . We will now show that the Normal random variable x is optimistic for $\tilde{y}$ and so complete the proof of Lemma 1, $x \succ_{\text{so}} \tilde{y} \succ_{\text{so}} y$.

Unfortunately, unlike the case of Beta vs Dirichlet it is quite difficult to show this optimism relationship between Gaussian x and Beta $\tilde{y}$ directly. Instead we make an appeal to the stronger dominance relationship of single-crossing CDFs.

Definition 2 (Single crossing dominance).

Let X and Y be real-valued random variables with CDFs F_X and F_Y respectively. We say that X single-crossing dominates Y if $\mathbb{E}[X] \geq \mathbb{E}[Y]$ and there a crossing point $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that:

$$F_X(s) \geq F_Y(s) \iff s \leq a. \quad (9)$$

Note that single crossing dominance implies stochastic optimism. The remainder of this section is devoted to proving that the following lemma:

Lemma 9. Let $\tilde{y} \sim \text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ for any $\alpha > 0, \beta > 0$ and $x \sim N\left(\mu = \frac{\alpha}{\alpha+\beta}, \sigma^2 = \frac{1}{\alpha+\beta}\right)$. Then, x single crossing dominates $\tilde{y}$.

Trivially, these two distributions will always have equal means so it is enough to show that their CDFs can cross at most once on $(0, 1)$.

D.3 Double crossing PDFs

By repeated application of the mean value theorem, if we want to prove that the CDFs cross at most once on $(0, 1)$ then it is sufficient to prove that the PDFs cross at most twice on the same interval. Our strategy will be to show via mechanical calculus that for the known densities of x and $\tilde{y}$ the PDFs cross at most twice on $(0, 1)$. We lament that the proof as it stands is so laborious, but our attempts at a more elegant solution has so far been unsuccessful. The remainder of this appendix is devoted to proving this “double-crossing” property via manipulation of the PDFs for different values of α, β .

We write f_N for the density of the Normal x and f_B for the density of the Beta $\tilde{y}$ respectively. We know that at the boundary $f_N(0-) > f_B(0-)$ and $f_N(1+) > f_B(1+)$ where the $\pm$ represents the left and right limits respectively. Since the densities are positive over the interval, we can consider the log PDFs instead.

$$l_B(x) = (\alpha - 1) \log(x) + (\beta - 1) \log(1 - x) + K_B$$

$$l_N(x) = -\frac{1}{2}(\alpha + \beta) \left(x - \frac{\alpha}{\alpha + \beta} \right)^2 + K_N$$

Since $\log(x)$ is injective and increasing, if we could show that $l_N(x) - l_B(x) = 0$ has at most two solutions on the interval we would be done.

Instead we will attempt to prove an even stronger condition, that $l'_N(x) - l'_B(x) = 0$ has at most one solution in the interval. This is not necessary for what we actually want to show, but it is sufficient and easier to deal with since we can ignore the annoying constants.

$$\begin{aligned} l'_B(x) &= \frac{\alpha - 1}{x} - \frac{\beta - 1}{1 - x} \\ l'_N(x) &= \alpha - (\alpha + \beta)x \end{aligned}$$

Finally we will consider an even stronger condition, if $l''_N(x) - l''_B(x) = 0$ has no solution then $l'_B(x) - l'_N(x)$ must be monotone over the region and so it can have at most one root.

$$\begin{aligned} l''_B(x) &= -\frac{\alpha - 1}{x^2} - \frac{\beta - 1}{(1 - x)^2} \\ l''_N(x) &= -(\alpha + \beta) \end{aligned}$$

So now let us define:

$$h(x) := l''_N(x) - l''_B(x) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{x^2} + \frac{\beta - 1}{(1 - x)^2} - (\alpha + \beta) \quad (10)$$

Our goal now is to show that $h(x) = 0$ does not have any solutions for $x \in [0, 1]$.

Once again, we will look at the derivatives and analyse them for different values of $\alpha, \beta > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} h'(x) &= -2 \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{x^3} - \frac{\beta - 1}{(1 - x)^3} \right) \\ h''(x) &= 6 \left(\frac{\alpha - 1}{x^4} + \frac{\beta - 1}{(1 - x)^4} \right) \end{aligned}$$

D.3.1 Special case $\alpha > 1, \beta \leq 1$

In this region we want to show that actually $g(x) = l'_N(x) - l'_B(x)$ has no solutions. We follow a very similar line of argument and write $A = \alpha - 1 > 0$ and $B = \beta - 1 \leq 0$ as before.

$$g(x) = \alpha - (\alpha + \beta)x + \frac{\beta - 1}{1 - x} - \frac{\alpha - 1}{x}$$

$$g'(x) = h(x) = \frac{A}{x^2} + \frac{B}{(1-x)^2} - (\alpha + \beta)$$

$$g''(x) = h'(x) = -2 \left(\frac{A}{x^3} - \frac{B}{(1-x)^3} \right)$$

Now since $B \leq 0$ we note that $g''(x) \leq 0$ and so $g(x)$ is a concave function. If we can show that the maximum of g lies below 0 then we know that there can be no roots.

We now attempt to solve $g'(x) = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} g'(x) &= \frac{A}{x^2} + \frac{B}{(1-x)^2} = 0 \\ \implies -A/B &= \left(\frac{x}{1-x} \right)^2 \\ \implies x &= \frac{K}{1+K} \in (0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

Where here we write $K = \sqrt{-A/B} > 0$. We're ignoring the case of $B = 0$ as this is even easier to show separately. We now evaluate the function g at its minimum $x_K = \frac{K}{1+K}$ and write $C = -B \geq 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} g(x_K) &= (A+1) - (A+B+2) \frac{K}{1+K} + B(1+K) - A \frac{1+K}{K} \\ &= -AK^2 - AK - A + BK^3 + BK^2 + BK - K^2 + K \\ &= -AK^2 - AK - A - CK^3 - CK^2 - CK - K^2 + K \\ &= -A(A/C) - A(A/C)^{1/2} - A - C(A/C)^{3/2} - C(A/C) - C(A/C)^{1/2} - A/C + (A/C)^{1/2} \\ &= -A^2C^{-1} - A^{3/2}C^{-1/2} - A - A^{3/2}C^{-1/2} - A - A^{1/2}C^{1/2} - AC^{-1} + A^{1/2}C^{1/2} \\ &= -A^2C^{-1} - 2A^{3/2}C^{-1/2} - 2A - AC^{-1} \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore we are done with this sub proof. The case of $\alpha \leq 1, \beta > 1$ can be dealt with similarly.

D.3.2 Convex function $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1, (\alpha - 1)(\beta - 1) \geq \frac{1}{9}$

In the case of $\alpha, \beta > 1$ we know that $h(x)$ is a convex function on $(0, 1)$. So now if we solve $h'(x^*) = 0$ and $h(x^*) > 0$ then we have proved our statement. We will write $A = \alpha - 1, B = \beta - 1$ for convenience.

We now attempt to solve $h'(x) = 0$

$$\begin{aligned} h'(x) &= \frac{A}{x^3} - \frac{B}{(1-x)^3} = 0 \\ \implies A/B &= \left(\frac{x}{1-x} \right)^3 \\ \implies x &= \frac{K}{1+K} \in (0, 1) \end{aligned}$$

Where for convenience we have written $K = (A/B)^{1/3} > 0$. We now evaluate the function h at its minimum $x_K = \frac{K}{1+K}$.

$$\begin{aligned} h(x_K) &= A \frac{(K+1)^2}{K^2} + B(K+1)^2 - (A+B+2) \\ &= A(2/K + 1/K^2) + B(K^2 + 2K) - 2 \\ &= 3(A^{2/3}B^{1/3} + A^{1/3}B^{2/3}) - 2 \end{aligned}$$

So as long as $h(x_K) > 0$ we have shown that the CDFs are single crossing. We note a simpler characterization of A, B that guarantees this condition:

$$A, B \geq 1/3 \implies AB \geq 1/9 \implies (A^{2/3}B^{1/3} + A^{1/3}B^{2/3}) \geq 2/3$$

And so we have shown that somehow for α, β large enough away from 1 we are OK. Certainly we have proved the result for $\alpha, \beta \geq 4/3$.

D.3.3 Final region $\{\alpha > 1, \beta > 1, (\alpha - 1)(\beta - 1) \leq \frac{1}{9}\}$

We now produce a final argument that even in this remaining region the two PDFs are at most double crossing. The argument is really no different than before, the only difficulty is that it is not enough to only look at the derivatives of the log likelihoods, we need to use some bound on the normalizing constants to get our bounds. By symmetry in the problem, it will suffice to consider only the case $\alpha > \beta$, the other result follows similarly.

In this region of interest, we know that $\beta \in (1, \frac{4}{3})$ and so we will make use of an upper bound to the normalizing constant of the Beta distribution, the Beta function.

$$\begin{aligned} B(\alpha, \beta) &= \int_{x=0}^1 x^{\alpha-1} (1-x)^{\beta-1} dx \\ &\leq \int_{x=0}^1 x^{\alpha-1} dx = \frac{1}{\alpha} \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Our thinking is that, because in $\mathcal{B}$ the value of $\beta - 1$ is relatively small, this approximation will not be too bad. Therefore, we can explicitly bound the log likelihood of the Beta distribution:

$$l_B(x) \geq \tilde{l}_B(x) := (\alpha - 1) \log(x) + (\beta - 1) \log(1 - x) + \log(\alpha)$$

We will now make use of a calculus argument as in the previous sections of the proof. We want to find two points $x_1 < x_2$ for which $h(x_i) = l'_N(x) - l'_B(x) > 0$. Since $\alpha, \beta > 1$ we know that h is convex and so for all $x \notin [x_1, x_2]$ then $h > 0$. If we can also show that the gap of the Beta over the maximum of the normal log likelihood

$$\text{Gap} : l_B(x_i) - l_N(x_i) \geq f(x_i) := \tilde{l}_B(x_i) - \max_x l_N(x) > 0 \tag{12}$$

is positive then it must mean there are no crossings over the region $[x_1, x_2]$, since $\tilde{l}_B$ is concave and therefore totally above the maximum of l_N over the whole region $[x_1, x_2]$.

Now consider the regions $x \in [0, x_1)$, we know by consideration of the tails that if there is more than one root in this segment then there must be at least three crossings. If there are three crossings, then the second derivative of their difference h must have at least one root on this region. However we know that h is convex, so if we can show that $h(x_i) > 0$ this cannot be possible. We use a similar argument for $x \in (x_2, 1]$. We will now complete this proof by lengthy amounts of calculus.

Let's remind ourselves of the definition:

$$h(x) := l''_N(x) - l''_B(x) = \frac{\alpha - 1}{x^2} + \frac{\beta - 1}{(1 - x)^2} - (\alpha + \beta)$$

For ease of notation we will write $A = \alpha - 1, B = \beta - 1$. We note that:

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &\geq h_1(x) = \frac{A}{x^2} - (A + B + 2) \\ h(x) &\geq h_2(x) = \frac{B}{(1 - x)^2} - (A + B + 2) \end{aligned}$$

and we solve for $h_1(x_1) = 0, h_2(x_2) = 0$. This means that

$$x_1 = \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}$$

$$x_2 = 1 - \sqrt{\frac{B}{A+B+2}}$$

and clearly $h(x_1) > 0, h(x_2) > 0$. Now, if we can show that, for all possible values of A, B in this region $f(x_i) = l_B(x_i) - \max_x l_N(x) > 0$, our proof will be complete.

We will now write $f(x_i) = f_i(A, B)$ to make the dependence on A, B more clear.

$$f_1(A, B) = \log(1+A) + A \log\left(\sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right) + B \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log(A+B+2)$$

$$f_2(A, B) = \log(1+A) + A \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{B}{A+B+2}}\right) + B \log\left(\sqrt{\frac{B}{A+B+2}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log(A+B+2)$$

We will now show that $\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial B} \leq 0$ for all of the values in our region $A > B > 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_1}{\partial B} &= -\frac{A}{2(A+B+2)} + \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right) + \frac{B\sqrt{A}}{2(A+B+2)^{3/2}\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right)} - \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \left(\frac{B\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{A+B+2}\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right)} - A - 1 \right) + \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \left(\frac{B\sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{A+B+2} - \sqrt{A}} - A - 1 \right) + \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \left(\frac{\sqrt{B}/3}{\sqrt{A+B+2} - \sqrt{A}} - A - 1 \right) - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \left(\frac{1}{3} \sqrt{\frac{B}{B+2}} - A - 1 \right) - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}} \\ &\leq -\frac{A}{2(A+B+2)} - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+B+2}} \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

and similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial B} &= -A \left(\frac{\sqrt{\frac{B}{A+B+2}}}{2B} + \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \right) + \log\left(\sqrt{\frac{B}{A+B+2}}\right) + B \left(\frac{A+2}{2B(A+B+2)} \right) - \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \left(A+2 - A - 1 - A\sqrt{\frac{A+B+2}{B}} \right) + \log\left(\sqrt{\frac{B}{A+B+2}}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2(A+B+2)} \left(1 - A\sqrt{\frac{A+B+2}{B}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{B}{A+B+2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we can look at each term to observe that $\frac{\partial^2 f_2}{\partial A \partial B} < 0$. Therefore this expression $\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial B}$ is maximized over A for

$A = 0$. We now examine this expression:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial B}\bigg|_{A=0} &= \frac{1}{2(B+2)} + \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{B}{B+2}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{B+2} + \frac{B}{B+2} - 1 \right) \\ &\leq 0\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the expressions f_i are minimized at the largest possible $B = \frac{1}{9A}$ for any given A over our region. We will now write $g_i(A) := f_i(A, \frac{1}{9A})$ for this evaluation at the extremal boundary. If we can show that $g_i(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \geq \frac{1}{3}$ and $i = 1, 2$ we will be done.

We will perform a similar argument to show that g_i is monotone increasing, $g'_i(A) \geq 0$ for all $A \geq \frac{1}{3}$.

$$\begin{aligned}g_1(A) &= \log(1+A) + A \log\left(\sqrt{\frac{A}{A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2}}\right) + \frac{1}{9A} \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2}}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log\left(A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2\right) \\ &= \log(1+A) + \frac{A}{2} \log(A) - \frac{1}{2}(1+A) \log\left(A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{9A} \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi)\end{aligned}$$

Note that the function $p(A) = A + \frac{1}{9A}$ is increasing in A for $A \geq \frac{1}{3}$. We can conservatively bound g from below noting $\frac{1}{9A} \leq 1$ in our region.

$$\begin{aligned}g_1(A) &\geq \log(1+A) + \frac{A}{2} \log(A) - \frac{1}{2}(1+A) \log(A+3) + \frac{1}{9A} \log\left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{A}{A+2}}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) \\ &\geq \log(1+A) + \frac{A}{2} \log(A) - \frac{1}{2}(1+A) \log(A+3) - \frac{1}{9A} \sqrt{A} + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) =: \tilde{g}_1(A)\end{aligned}$$

Now we can use calculus to say that:

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}'_1(A) &= \frac{1}{A+1} + \frac{1}{A+3} + \frac{\log(A)}{2} + \frac{1}{18A^{3/2}} - \frac{1}{2} \log(A+3) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{A+1} + \frac{1}{A+3} + \frac{1}{18A^{3/2}} + \frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{A}{A+3}\right)\end{aligned}$$

This expression is monotone decreasing in A and with a limit ≥ 0 and so we can say that $\tilde{g}_1(A)$ is monotone increasing. Therefore $g_1(A) \geq \tilde{g}_1(A) \geq \tilde{g}_1(1/3)$ for all A . We can explicitly evaluate this numerically and $\tilde{g}_1(1/3) > 0.01$ so we are done.

The final piece of this proof is to do a similar argument for $g_2(A)$

$$\begin{aligned}
g_2(A) &= \log(1+A) + A \log \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{9A}}{A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2}} \right) + \frac{1}{9A} \log \left(\sqrt{\frac{\frac{1}{9A}}{A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2}} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log \left(A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2 \right) \\
&= \log(1+A) + A \log \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{1}{9A^2 + 18A + 1}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{9A} \log \left(\frac{1}{9A} \right) \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{9A} + 1 \right) \log \left(A + \frac{1}{9A} + 2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) \\
&\geq \log(1+A) + A \left(-\frac{1}{\sqrt{9A^2}} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{9A} \log \left(\frac{1}{9A} \right) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{3} + 1 \right) \log \left(A + \frac{1}{3} + 2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) \\
&\geq \log(1+A) - \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{2e} - \frac{2}{3} \log \left(A + \frac{7}{3} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \log(2\pi) =: \tilde{g}_2(A)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, once again we can see that $\tilde{g}_2$ is monotone increasing:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{g}_2'(A) &= \frac{1}{1+A} - \frac{2/3}{A+7/3} \\
&= \frac{A+5}{(A+1)(3A+7)} \geq 0
\end{aligned}$$

We complete the argument by noting $g_2(A) \geq \tilde{g}_2(A) \geq \tilde{g}_2(1/3) > 0.01$, which concludes our proof of the PDF double crossing in this region.

D.4 Recap

Using the results of the previous sections we complete the proof of Lemma 9 for Gaussian vs Beta dominance for all possible $\alpha, \beta > 0$. Piecing together Lemma 8 with Lemma 9 completes our proof of Lemma 1. We imagine that there is a much more elegant and general proof method available for future work.